REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 13-14, 16, and 19 have been amended herein. Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are pending and are in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 8 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Conway, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0236777.

Regarding claim 1, Conway does not teach "<u>wherein communicating to the one or more display devices comprises communicating the one or more indications to a broadcasting device and sending the one or more indications from the broadcasting device to the one or more display devices.</u>" Conway does not teach a broadcasting device that receives indications and then sends the indications to other devices. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

Regarding claim 8, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 8. The same reasons traversing the rejection above for claim 1 are applicable here. Conway does not teach a broadcasting device that receives a plurality of status indicators and then sends the plurality of status indicators to receiving components. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be removed.

Regarding claim 19, Conway does not teach "a first user-interface component", "a transaction-processing system" and "a second user-interface component" bundled into one computer system. Conway does not disclose a computer system with all of the elements of claim 19. For example, a web page or web portal in Conway is not part of a computer system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 20-22 depend from claim 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20-22 be removed.

Regarding claim 23, Conway does not teach "withholding processing control from said user" nor "returning processing control to said user". The same reasons traversing the rejections provided below for claims 3 and 16 are applicable here. Conway teaches that an end-user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. There is nothing in Conway that discloses withholding processing control. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Applicants' claimed invention does not indicate any type of intervention. The broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 23 does not indicate any type of intervention (manual/user/external). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be removed.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0236777 in view of Dugan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 be removed.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants respectfully point out that the Office Action specifically rejects claim 3 on the grounds that user control is withheld until manual/user/external intervention is needed. However, the Office Action provides remarks to Applicants' arguments traversing the rejection of claim 3 by stating that "Conway teaches the capability of both automatic and manual execution." The Office Action further states "manual

intervention may not be necessary..." Applicants respectfully object to the inconsistent reasoning. The Office Action should not render a rejection of claim 3 on one hand stating manual intervention teaches claim 3, but dismisses Applicants' traversal of the rejection by stating there can be automatic execution.

Further, regarding claim 3, Conway does not teach "receiving a transaction includes suspending user control until said transaction is received but prior to when said transaction is completed." Conway teaches that an end-user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. In addition, Conway teaches that if the host is unavailable or cannot complete the transaction due to issues other than unavailability, the transaction is not completed. Manual or external intervention is needed as the Examiner states in the Office Action. See paragraph [0012] in Conway. Consequently, the disclosure in Conway does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention. First, there is nothing in Conway that discloses user control being suspended. The operative word is "suspending". The Examiner must give patentable weight to the term. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Secondly, any use of manual intervention is inconsistent with claim 1 which requires "without user interaction". That requirement carries over to dependent claim 3. Conway discloses manual intervention which is contrary to Applicants' claimed invention. Thirdly, Conway discloses a transaction that is complete. When the results are returned to the end-user, this is evidence of a completed transaction. Applicants' claimed invention requires that user control only be suspended for a time before the completion of the transaction, not with the completion and not after the completion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 4 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be removed.

Regarding claim 5, Conway does not teach "communicating indications corresponding to disparate transactions to one or more display devices wherein disparate transactions are separate distinct transactions." Conway discloses at paragraph [0037] "instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction may be sent to the transaction agent or a wireless communication method may be used to update the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request. This language in Conway indicates that Applicants' claimed invention is not anticipated. Applicants' claimed invention requires communicating indications related to disparate transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction. Disparate transactions require separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 6-7 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6-7 be removed.

Claims 9-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0236777.

For at least the above reasons, claims 9-12 depend from claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9-12 be removed.

Regarding claim 13, Conway does not teach "wherein the unique transactions are separate distinct transactions." The reasoning provided above for claim 5 is applicable here. Applicants' claimed invention requires communicating status indicators related to unique transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction where instant messages are sent for one

transaction. Unique transactions equates to separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be removed.

Regarding claim 14, Conway does not teach "a status-transmission component that receives said feedback and communicates said feedback to one or more receiving devices." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be removed.

Regarding claim 16, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 16. The same reasons traversing the rejection provided above for claim 3 are applicable here. There is nothing in Conway that discloses the request-receiving component retaining processing control while receiving an incoming transaction. The Office Action stated for independent claim 14 that the request-receiving component is Host 150 in Conway. As such, Conway does not disclose the Host 150 retaining processor control. Host 150 cannot be used to anticipate request-receiving component in the independent claim 14 and be totally ignored in dependent claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 17-18 depend from claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17-18 be removed.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or lsearcy@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Searcy, II/

Leonard Searcy, II
Reg. No. 53,574

LS/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550